

Applicants: McMenimen et al.  
Application No.: 09/775,262  
Page 5

### **REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated August 13, 2003. Claims 1-7 are pending.

#### **Rejection for Obviousness-type Double Patenting:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 6-8 of copending Application No. 09/775,281. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and will address the merits of the rejection when allowable subject matter is indicated.

#### **Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duffin et al. (U.S. 5,752,976), in view of Bradbury et al. (2002/0007294A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully point out that the Published Application of Bradbury et al. is not prior art to the instant application under section 102(e)/103. Bradbury et al. was filed on April 5, 2001, and claims priority to a provisional patent application filed on April 5, 2000. However, the instant application was filed on February 1, 2001, and claims priority to a provisional application, Serial No. 60/180,289 which was filed on February 4, 2000. The priority date of the instant application precedes the priority date of the Bradbury et al. application. Therefore, Bradbury et al. is not prior art and any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 that relies upon Bradbury et al. must fail.

In view of the disqualification of the Bradbury et al. reference as prior art, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under section 103. Applicants in no way acquiesce, however, in the propriety of the Examiner's citation of Bradbury et al. or Duffin et al. on the merits. In particular, notwithstanding the ineligibility of Bradbury et al. as prior art, Applicants maintain that neither Duffin et al. nor Bradbury et al. provides any teaching that would have suggested the claimed invention.

Applicants: McMenimen et al.  
Application No.: 09/775,262  
Page 6

**CONCLUSION**

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/11/03



Daniel G. Chapik  
Registration No. 43,424  
MEDTRONIC, INC.  
Telephone: (763) 514-3066  
Facsimile: (763) 514-6982  
Customer No. 27581